



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,933	11/05/2001	Yong-Jae Kim	678-736(P9919)	9167
28249	7590	11/25/2005	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			PHAM, TUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,933	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. PHAM	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's remark, filed on 06/14/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-10 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Curtis et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,847,806).

In response to applicant's remark filed on page 2, Applicant argues that the Slipy's reference teaches a flip type phone having a replaceable faceplate.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the flip) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Claim fails to require the cover for the flip. Therefore, the teaching of Slipy reference still reads on ^s1,17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slipy et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,848,152, hereinafter, "Slipy") in view of Curtis et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,847,806, hereinafter, "Curtis").

Regarding claim 1, Slipy teaches a replaceable cover unit for a folder-type phone having a main body, a folder, a hinge device for rotatably connecting the folder to the main body, and a display, comprising (see figure 21): a slot formed around the periphery of the folder (see figure 2, mobile 100, slots 140, 142, 146, 148, col.5, ln.20-30); and a replaceable cover having at least one raised edge (i.e., Tab) for mating with the slot to cover the upper portion of a folder, detachable from the folder by remove the replaceable cover in the length direction of the folder-type phone (see figure 1, faceplate 104, slot 140, tab 174, col.5, ln.17-67), and locking unit for fixing the cover in the slot (see figure 1, finger slot 190, col.5, ln.60-65).

It should be noticed that Slipy fails to teach a sliding cover for a mobile phone. However, Curtis teaches such feature (see figure 1, front cover 2, col.1, ln.15-25, col.3, ln.35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Curtis into view of Slipy, in order to easily replace the cover without requiring any special training as suggested by Curtis at column 1, lines 15-20.

Regarding claim 2, Slipy further teaches a replaceable sliding cover unit further comprising a transparent window positioned to enable viewing of the display when the replaceable sliding cover is mounted to the folder (see figure 1, lens 126, col.5, ln.40-50).

Regarding claim 3, Curtis further teaches a replaceable sliding cover unit a groove formed along the slot; and protrusions formed at the periphery of the cover to mate with the groove (see figure 3, figure 4, lugs 32, lugs 30, col.4, ln.10-25).

Regarding claim 4, Curtis further teaches a replaceable sliding cover unit protrusions formed to face each other at both sides of the folder case; and grooves at positions of the raised edge corresponding to the protrusions (see figure 3, figure 4, lugs 32, lugs 30, col.4, ln.10-25).

Regarding claim 5, Slipy further teaches a replaceable sliding cover unit wherein the protrusions are formed near a center hinge arm of the folder (see figure 21, retainer 1622).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-8097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and

IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL Customer Service at (571) 272-2600 FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have question on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2643
November 17, 2005
Examiner

Tuan Pham



CURTIS KUNTZ
PATENT EXAMINER
NOV 17 2005